Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 9-11. This sheets, which include Fig. 9-11, replaces the original sheets including Figs. 9-11.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-21 are pending in this application. By the Office Action, Figs. 9-11 are objected to; claims 1 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b); and claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). By this Amendment, Figs. 9-11 are amended; claims 1, 4-10, and 12 are amended; claims 14-21 are added; and claim 2 is canceled. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found, for example, in claim 2; support for the amendments to claim 4 can be found, for example, in claim 1; and support for new claims 14-21 can be found, for example, in claims 6-13. Other claims are amended for clarity. No new matter is added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I.   Objection to the Figures

Figs. 9-11 are objected to as disclosing only the prior art, without being labeled as such. By this Amendment, Figs. 9-11 are amended as suggested by the Examiner to include the legend "Prior Art." Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

II.   Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Lee. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the rejection, non-rejected claim 4 is amended into independent form, and claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of non-rejected claim 2. Accordingly, the rejection is moot and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of Goto. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of Wolf. Because the rejections are related, they

are addressed together. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections with respect to the amended claims.

Each of independent claims 1 and 4 specify a Fresnel lens sheet of total-reflection type comprising: a flat base part; a plurality of prisms formed on an entrance surface of the base part, each of the prisms having a refraction facet that refracts light rays fallen thereon and a total-reflection facet that totally reflects light rays fallen thereon; a plurality of V grooves formed in an exit surface of the base part; and a plurality of wedge-shaped light absorbing parts embedded in the V grooves, respectively, the light absorbing parts having a refractive index lower than that of the base part; wherein at least some of the light rays refracted and totally reflected by prisms are reflected by the inclined surfaces that are interfaces between the base part and the light absorbing parts embedded in the grooves of the base part, so that light rays travel outside through regions of the exit surface of the base part the regions being placed between adjacent light absorbing parts. Claims 1 and 4 further specify that two inclined surfaces of each of the light absorbing parts are symmetrical (claim 1) or asymmetrical (claim 4) with respect to a direction perpendicular to the base part, and satisfy respective conditions set forth and defined un the claims. Such Fresnel lens sheet of total-reflection type are nowhere taught or suggested by the cited references.

In particular, claims 1 and 4 each specify that the prisms have <u>a refraction facet</u> that refracts light rays fallen thereon and <u>a total-reflection facet</u> that totally reflects light rays fallen thereon. That is, the Fresnel lens sheet of claims 1 and 4 is a total-reflection type. Claims 1 also specifies that two inclined surfaces of each of the light absorbing parts are <u>symmetrical</u> with respect to a direction perpendicular to the base part, and satisfy the condition $\tan^{-1} (2D/W_1) \geq \sin^{-1} (N_1/N_2)$. Claim 4 specifies that two inclined surfaces of each of the light absorbing parts are <u>asymmetrical</u> with respect to a direction perpendicular to the

base part, and satisfy the two conditions $\tan^{-1} (D/W_3) \geq \sin^{-1} (N_1/N_2)$ and $\tan^{-1} (D/W_4) \geq \sin^{-1} (N_1/N_2)$.

With respect to claims 1 and 4, the Office Action argues that Lee discloses all of the claim limitations, except for the limitations regarding the conditions of the two inclined surfaces of each of the light absorbing parts being symmetrical or asymmetrical with respect to a direction perpendicular to the base part. While the Office Action admits that Lee does not teach the stated conditions, the Office Action argues that Goto teaches the conditions, and in combination with Lee would have rendered obvious the claimed invention. Applicants disagree.

In fact, Applicants submit that neither Lee nor Goto teaches or suggests at least the features of claims 1 and 4, that the prisms have a refraction facet that refracts light rays fallen thereon and a total-reflection facet that totally reflects light rays fallen thereon. As a result of this feature, combined with the conditions of the two inclined surfaces of each of the light absorbing parts being symmetrical or asymmetrical with respect to a direction perpendicular to the base part, unexpected results are obtained by the claimed invention. Specifically, according to the claimed invention, even if light rays fall on the entrance surface of the base part at small incident angles, such as in the range of about 35° to about 45°, the formation of double images can be effectively suppressed. See, for example, the specification at page 6, lines 23-30. Such effects have not previously been provided by the prior art, and thus the claimed invention provides superior and unexpected results over the prior art.

Nowhere does Lee or Goto teach or suggest either the provided unexpected results, or a means to provide such results. Neither reference teaches or suggests that the Fresnel lens sheet is of the total-reflection type, where the prisms have a refraction facet that refracts light rays fallen thereon and a total-reflection facet that totally reflects light rays fallen thereon, and where two inclined surfaces of each of the light absorbing parts are symmetrical or

-10-

asymmetrical with respect to a direction perpendicular to the base part, and satisfy the stated conditions.

Furthermore, the references are improperly combined, at least because neither reference provides the requisite motivation for one or ordinary skill in the art to have looked to the other reference to improve the disclosed devices. At most, the only motivation to combine the cited references and modify the resultant combination comes only from the instant application, based on an improper hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention, picking and choosing different claim limitations from different references. Such a rejection is improper, and cannot be sustained.

Wolf is cited with respect to the limitations of claims 3 and 5. However, Wolf does not cure the deficiencies of Lee and Goto, described above. Regardless of its actual disclosure, Wolf fails to overcome the deficiencies of Lee and Goto, and thus any combination of Lee, Goto, and/or Wolf would not have rendered obvious the claimed invention.

Claims 1 and 4 would thus not have been obvious over the cited references. Claims 3 and 5-21 variously depend from claim 1 or claim 4, and are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 4, in addition to the limitations therein. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Joel S. Armstrong
Registration No. 36,430

JAO:JSA

Date: January 31, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461